

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended and claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16 are amended. Claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 are amended to more fully define over the applied references. Claims 4, 5, 11, 14 and 16 are amended to correct typos. Support for the amended claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 may be found in the original specification at, for example, paragraphs [0042], [0052], [0053], [0087] and FIG. 1. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Nguyen at the interview held February 5, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Objections to the Specification

The Patent Office requested that the specification be updated to reflect the current status of related applications in paragraphs [0016], [0019], [0038], [0060] and [0086].

Paragraphs [0016], [0019] and [0060] are amended to reflect changes, if any, of the status of the related applications. As such, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Patent Office alleges that claim 1 is unclear as to the connections between the mobile device, the document processing device, the output server and the first and second networks.

As explained during the interview, with reference to FIG. 1, the mobile device 120 establishes two separate connections (e.g., connection 128 and connection 130) with

document processing device 114, the document processing device 114 connects the mobile device 120 to the first network (e.g., foreign network 122), the first network is connected to the second network (e.g., native network 104), and the second network is connected to output server 124.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested as claim 1 is clear with regards to the connections between the mobile device, the document processing device, the output server and the first and second networks, discussed above.

Claim Rejections

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003-0002072 ("Berkema").*

Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003-0217103 ("Yamamoto").

Claims 1-9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Berkema in view of Yamamoto.

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the above rejections.

Claims 14-16

Berkema fails to teach or suggest a method for controlling a plurality of document service requests at a mobile device to be carried out at a document processing device, including establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device, defining in a job ticket for an identified document received through the first connection at the mobile device a workflow that specifies two or more document service requests for which at least one of the plurality of document service

* The Office Action incorrectly indicates that Berkema's U.S. Publication No. is 2005-0030375. Berkema's correct U.S. Publication No. is 2003-0002072, as shown above.

requests is to be performed at the document processing device, transmitting from the second connection the job ticket from the mobile device to the document processing device upon receipt of input instructing the document service request to be carried out at the document processing device, and wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections as recited in claim 14.

As discussed during the interview, the Patent Office concedes that Berkema fails to teach or suggest establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device (see Office Action, page 8, last paragraph).

Thus, as claim 14 includes the feature of establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device, claim 14, and dependent claims therefrom, are patentable over Berkema. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to claims 14-16 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12

Yamamoto fails to teach or suggest a method for submitting a document service request from a mobile device to a document processing device coupled to a first network and being adapted to communicate with one or more servers coupled to a second network, including establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections, as recited in claim 10.

The Patent Office alleges that P53 and P63 in FIG. 4 of Yamamoto represent a first and second connection, respectively, between mobile phone (alleged mobile device) and a printer (alleged document processing device). However, as discussed during the interview, at best, FIG. 4 discloses that a first connection is established and thereafter reestablished with a document processing device. That is, there is only one connection from the mobile phone

disclosed in Yamamoto to the printer, and this connection may be terminated and thereafter reestablished. Nowhere does Yamamoto teach or suggest establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections, as recited in claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 10, and dependent claims therefrom, are patentable over Yamamoto. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to claims 10-12 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a method for submitting a document service request from a mobile device to a document processing device coupled to a first network and being adapted to communicate with one or more servers coupled to a second network, including establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections, as recited in claim 1.

The Patent Office concedes that Berkema fails to teach or suggest establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device and relies on Yamamoto as allegedly disclosing this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As mentioned above, nowhere does Yamamoto teach or suggest establishing, from the mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with the document processing device wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections, as recited in claim 1.

Further, claim 13 also includes the feature of establishing, from a mobile device, a first connection and a second connection with a document processing device wherein the first connection and the second connection are separate connections.

Thus, for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claims 10 and 14, claims 1 and 13 are also neither taught nor suggest by the applied references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 13, and dependent claims therefrom, are patentable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/hs

Date: February 19, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--